United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/28/ZMB/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
18 August 2017

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-eighth session
6 – 17 November 2017

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Zambia*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 16 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. A separate section is provided for the contribution by the national human rights institution that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. While noting that a de facto moratorium on the death penalty had been maintained since 1997, ZHRC stated that there has been a sharp increase in the number of inmates on death-row and recommended ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty. ZHRC also recommended ratification of the three Optional Protocols to Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.[2]

3. ZHRC noted that at its universal periodic review in 2012 ("2012 review")[3], the Republic of Zambia ("Government and "Zambia", respectively) "pledged" to issue a

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

GE.17-14288(E)

Please recycle

standing invitation to Special Procedures Mechanism of the Human Rights Council,[4] and stated that only two of the ten requests for visits by special rapporteurs had since been granted by the Government.[5]

4. While noting progressive efforts to implement recommendations from the 2012 review, ZHRC expressed concern about the lack of a strong inter-ministerial mechanism, a stakeholder coordination mechanism and an implementation plan for the implementation of recommendations.[6]

5. ZHRC stated that Zambia was yet to integrate the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment into the domestic legal framework. ZHRC further stated that its campaign against torture gave birth to a draft Anti-Torture Bill, which will need the support of the Government to be passed into law.[7]

6. While noting the commitment of Zambia to protect victims of human trafficking, ZHRC recommended amending the Anti-Human Trafficking Act No. 11 of 2008 to ensure that victims of human trafficking were not prosecuted.[8]

7. ZHRC stated that the Bill of Rights did not make economic, social and cultural rights justiciable and the 2016 national referendum was an unsuccessful attempt at expanding the Bill of Rights in that regard. It made recommendations including the establishment of a road map to guide the process of enacting a new bill of rights.[9]

8. ZHRC stated that insufficient resources had continued to undermine its capacity to conduct activities on the promotion and protection of human rights throughout the country. Furthermore, since 2015 funding to the Commission had been steadily reduced.[10]

9. ZHRC stated that in 2015, it had conducted a base-line assessment of business and human rights and recommended that Zambia develop a national action plan on business and human rights premised on this assessment. It also recommended designating a focal point institution to spearhead implementation of the United Nations Guiding Principles on business and human rights.[11]

10. While noting the positive measures that had been taken,[12] ZHRC expressed concern that detention facilities continued to be characterized by problems of overcrowding, poor sanitation, lack of meaningful separation of juveniles from adults, impoverished holding facilities for women, poor health and medical care including pre-natal and post-natal services, poor welfare services for circumstantial children, among other things.[13]

11. ZHRC stated that the country experienced unprecedented levels of political intolerance and violence before, during and immediately after the 11th August 2016 general election. It expressed grave concerns over violent actions of political party cadres and police officers which left several people injured, caused loss of life and property, curtailed freedom of assembly and expression and bred a culture of fear among the electorate and political players. ZHRC commended steps taken by Government to appoint a Commission of Inquiry and recommended making public the finding of this Commission when they become available. It also recommended fully implementing the recommendations that will be made by the Commission.[14]

12. ZHRC stated that the manner in which the laws have been applied negated the spirit of the constitutional provisions on freedom of assembly and expression. It noted with concern incidences of brutality, alleged corruption and selective application of the Public Order Act by the Police and thereby infringing on the rights of individuals believed to, or actually holding divergent views from the Government, opposition political parties and or groups believed to be critical of the Government.[15]

13. ZHRC stated that it had observed incidences of attacks on journalists and media houses by party cadres and the police, including closure or threats of closure of media

houses by regulatory authorities. The lack of protection for journalists, the lack of access to information and the weak regulatory mechanisms remained daunting challenges to the media-operating environment.[16]

14. While noting efforts by the Government to ensure sexual and reproductive health and rights, ZHRC stated that a national assessment raised a number of relevant concerns including the high unmet need for contraception, persistent barriers in access and availability of quality and affordable health care for pregnant women and mothers thus resulting in high maternal deaths, persistently high sexual and gender-based violence, persistent barriers in access to adolescent-friendly health services thus resulting in high teenage pregnancy rates, high HIV rates among young adults between the ages of 20 to 24 years, and a high rate of child-marriage, as well as constrained legal provisions for safe abortion services.[17]

15. ZHRC stated that although significant progress had been made by Zambia in fulfilling the right to education, there were concerns such as the high costs of tertiary education which remained prohibitive for children from poor families, despite the support provided by the Government in the form of bursaries and loans. While remarkable progress has been made in urban areas, school-going children in rural areas still travelled long distances to access education. Teacher-pupil ratio remained high. The progression rate to secondary and tertiary levels, especially among girls, remained low due to teenage pregnancy and child-marriage. Infrastructure in schools in rural areas was poor and inadequate and there was a persistent lack of learning materials in those schools.[18]

16. ZHRC stated that positive steps had been taken to incorporate the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities into the domestic legal framework through the enactment of the Persons with Disabilities Act No. 6 of 2012. However, a number of laws were not in conformity with the Convention.[19]

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[20]

17. SALC stated that Zambia was yet to ratify some important instruments relevant for the advancement of human rights and recommended ratification of all outstanding human rights treaties, including the Optional Protocol to Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Optional Protocol to Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and the three Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.[21]

18. APG23 recommended ratification of the Optional Protocol to Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.[22]

19. JS3[23] recommended ratification of the three Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, as well as all outstanding human rights treaties.[24]

20. AI stated that Zambia had enacted the Ratification of International Agreements Act of 2016, which guides the process of ratifying international agreements and the domestication of those agreements.[25]

21. JS3 stated that the Ratification of International Agreements Act of 2016 may prove an impediment to the speedy ratification of human rights instruments and recommended its review.[26]

22. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the 2012 review, AI recommended that Zambia issue a standing invitation to the Special Procedures Mechanism of the Human Rights Council.[27]

23. JS3 stated that Zambia had not submitted a mid-term report on the implementation of recommendations from the 2012 review.[28]

24. APG23 recommended that Zambia ensure the effective implementation of the recommendations from the upcoming review and in that regard it recommended the establishment of a permanent governmental mechanism to oversee the implementation of those recommendations.[29] ERI made a similar recommendation.[30]

B. National human rights framework[31]

25. AI welcomed the new Constitution which was approved on 5 January 2016 after being passed into law through an act of Parliament, stating that it contained progressive provisions on non-discrimination. However, a proposed new Bill of Rights, which could only be adopted by referendum, was not adopted at the referendum held on 11 August 2016, leaving the country to revert back to the old Bill of Rights. AI stated that the old Bill of Rights did not include economic, social and cultural rights.[32]

26. PAI called for an amendment of the Constitution to include gender-identity as a ground for discrimination.[33]

27. Recalling that at the 2012 review, Zambia supported a recommendation to fully align its national legislation with the provisions of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, HRW recommended that Zambia implement the Rome Statute through national legislation, including by incorporating provisions to cooperate promptly and fully with the International Criminal Court.[34]

28. JS3 stated that the National Coordinating Council for Children was yet to be functional.[35]

29. JS5 stated that the national health and HIV policies and strategies did not have a clear definition of key populations. This may lead to some vulnerable groups falling through the cracks and not receiving the necessary HIV programming. Also, the absence of a clear definition of key populations may inhibit Government accountability.[36]

30. JS1 stated that the recommendation on the prioritization of human rights education and awareness-raising in the Government's plans, strategies and programmes, has not been implemented.[37]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[38]

31. AI stated that the Government Authorities have allowed politicians to incite hatred causing discrimination and demonization of the Tonga ethnic group, based in the southern province of Zambia. During the run-up to the 2016 election, the authorities did not clamp down on the use of hateful rhetoric, discrimination and violence towards the Tonga ethnic group. Senior state officials made some derogatory remarks against the Tonga, in particular against opposition party activists from that tribal group. Pursuant to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Zambia has an

obligation to prohibit and bring an end to racial discrimination perpetrated by any persons, group or organisation.[39]

12. Citing cases of persons being arrested on charges related to sexual orientation or gender identify, HRW stated that those persons were subjected to forced anal examinations, which was a form of cruel, degrading and inhuman treatment that could rise to the level of torture.[40]

13. RFSU stated that Article 155 of the Penal Code had been widely interpreted as the legal basis for criminalizing same-sex relations while the Constitution prohibited discrimination and provided for the rights to equality and privacy. This ambivalence, coupled with the lack of a sound policy against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity has led to a systematic denial of the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons.[41] RFSU made recommendation including the decriminalization of same-sex relations between consenting adults.[42]

Development, the environment and business and human rights[43]

14. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the 2012 review, JS2 stated that there have been positive developments in terms of improving the legal and institutional framework for the mining sector, which included the amendment of the Mines and Minerals Development Act in 2015.[44] Notwithstanding, several challenges persisted to ensure the protection of human rights and the environment in the mining areas. There were gaps in the Act, especially in relation to prior consultation and meaningful engagement of local communities in decisions that affect them and the provision of adequate compensation in cases of relocation. Moreover, the existing legislation has not been adequately implemented and there was a lack of coordination between responsible institutions.[45]

2. Civil and Political Rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[46]

15. AI noted that following her visit to Zambia, the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities highlighted how people with albinism lived in constant fear of being attacked and killed for their body parts and expressed concern that since 2015 at least 10 people with albinism have been killed.[47]

16. RFSU stated that the legislation and policies that were in place to address sexual, domestic and gender-based violence were insufficient and called for an improvement in their content and implementation. RFSU also called for the eradication of impunity for sexual, domestic and gender-based violence, a strengthening of knowledge and resources, and the promotion of an attitudinal change among judges, prosecutors, lawyers, police, health care providers, social service institutions, religious and traditional leaders and the communities.[48]

Administration of justice, including impunity and the rule of law

17. JS3 stated that children in conflict with the law had been subjected to constant and usually protracted pre-trial detention particularly if they had been jointly charged with adults. Furthermore, for children convicted of an offence, the delays in the issuance of the confirmation orders prolonged their detentions, as custodial sentences were only deemed to have commenced upon the issuance of confirmation orders.[49]

18. SALC stated that in August 2014, Zambia signed the amended Protocol on the Tribunal of the Southern Africa Development Community, which introduces substantial changes with implication on the protection of human rights by the Tribunal. If duly ratified, the amended Protocol will remove access to the Tribunal by individuals, as well as the

human rights jurisdiction of the Tribunal. SALC recommended that Zambia withdraw its commitment to the amended Protocol which violates the right of access to justice; and to promote the reinstatement of the rights of access of persons to the Tribunal.[50]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and politicol life[51]

39. JS1 stated that supported recommendations from the 2012 review relating to the freedoms of assembly and expression had not been implemented.[52] Referring to one such recommendation, AI stated that although Zambia had expressed its commitment to ensure that the rights to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly were upheld, it remained concerned that these rights continued to be restricted, including through the use of libel laws and the Public Order Act.[53]

40. AI stated that the Government remained intolerant of criticism and responded by using criminal defamation laws.[54] JS4 stated that freedom of expression remained criminalized by laws passed during the colonial era which were designed to crush dissent, and cited specific pieces of legislation in that regard.[55] Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the 2012 review, JS4 stated that since the 2012 review, there had been numerous cases of harassment and intimidation of the media. Journalists, especially from private media organizations, were routinely harassed by political party cadres, mainly from the ruling party. Independent media organizations received regular threats and harassment from Government officials. JS4 called for an investigation of such threats.[56]

41. SALC stated that all of the provisions related to criminal defamation in Chapter XVIII of the Penal Code did not comply with the international standards for freedom of expression and should be repealed.[57]

42. JS4 expressed concern over the Government's continued ownership of the main media institutions which included Zambia National Broadcasting Corporation, the Times of Zambia and the Zambia Daily Mail, which placed the opposition political parties at a disadvantage.[58]

43. JS1 expressed alarm by the continued use of the Public Order Act to unwarrantedly limit the exercise of the freedoms of peaceful assembly and association.[59] JS4 stated that the Act remained in its pre-independence form with the result that dissent, especially by members of the opposition political party, is crushed through their arrests or threats of arrest.[60]

44. JS1 stated that human rights defenders and civil society activists have been subjected to verbal and physical attacks by the security forces and members of the Government.[61] It called on Zambia to create and maintain, in law and in practice, an enabling environment for civil society, guaranteeing the freedoms of association, expression and peaceful assembly.[62]

45. AI stated that the Non-Governmental Organisations' Act, 2009 continued to interfere with the ability of non-governmental organizations to operate independently and freely without undue interference.[63]

46. JS1 stated that the recommendation in relation to legislation on access to information was only partially implemented, as the Access to Information Bill that was presented to Parliament was yet to be enacted.[64]

47. Referring to general election in 2016, TCC stated that pre-election violence caused an increase in tension creating a climate of fear and hindering the rights of citizens to participate in the election process as candidates and as voters.[65] TCC made recommendations including that Zambia promptly investigating claims of violence instigated by political parties.[66]

48. TCC stated that during the period leading up to the 2016 general election, opposition parties were restricted from holding rallies. These restrictions included the denial of flight clearances for aircrafts used by the opposition parties and the denial of permission to hold rallies.[67] TCC made recommendations including that Zambia provide a level playing field to all political parties and candidates.[68]

49. TCC stated that before the 2016 elections, Parliament passed a constitutional amendment and implementing legislation that all parliamentary and presidential candidates have at minimum a Grade 12 education. Given the systematic gender imbalance in the education system, far fewer women have completed Grade 12, leaving many women illegible for office. Consequently, there were a low number of female representatives in politics, with women occupying only 26 of the 156 parliamentary seats.[69]

50. TCC stated that following the 2016 election, institutions charged with resolving electoral disputed failed to uphold due process and to respect the right to an effective and timely legal remedy.[70]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[71]

51. Referring to relevant recommendations from the 2012 review, JS3 stated that Zambia was both a transit and destination country for trafficking in persons. There was also a prevalence of the trafficking of children from rural areas to urban areas.[72]

Right to privacy and right to family

52. JS5 stated that consensual same-sex relations were criminalised and punishable by prison sentences of up to 15 years.[73] SALC stated that there was no rational basis on which to criminalise consensual sexual acts taking place in private and made recommendations including repealing Sections 155 and 158 of the Penal Code Act.[74]

3. Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[75]

53. JS5 called for the repealing of all laws criminalizing sex-work, as well as the municipal bylaws which were used to harass and detain sex workers.[76]

Right to social security

54. JS3 stated that current social security measures were discretionary and recommended that Zambia make social security a legal entitlement.[77]

Right to an adequate standard of living[78]

55. JS3 stated that about 60 percent of the population lived in poverty, which included about 20 000 children some of whom have been deprived of a family environment and lived and worked on the streets. An analysis of the national budgets for child-related programmes revealed that while there was an increase in budgetary allocations for children's health and nutrition for 2013 to 2015, there was decrease in 2016.[79]

56. While recognising the relevant efforts that had been made, UPG23 stated that there remained serious problems of access to necessary and sufficient food.[80] It made recommendations including significantly increasing public funding for nutrition to achieve relevant goals in accordance with national and international commitments.[81]

Right to health[82]

57. JS5 stated that there was reluctance to provide information about contraception to unmarried girls due to cultural and religious expectations. Girls were often not comfortable in receiving contraceptives because they feared being judged by their communities.[83]

58. ADF stated that the high rates of maternal mortality had less to do with the legality of abortion *per se* and was largely due to an inability to access obstetric care, the lack of relevant information, and the lack of health workers, especially in the case of women living in poverty and in rural areas.[84] ADF made recommendations including that Zambia improve health care infrastructure, access to emergency obstetric care, midwife training and resources devoted to maternal health.[85]

59. JS5 stated that complicated procedural requirements and inadequate services limit the number of legal abortions. Thus, despite the liberal nature of the abortion law, there were continuing obstacles to obtaining a legal abortion and therefore a continued reliance on illegal abortion.[86]

60. RFSU stated that while the law allowed the termination of pregnancy under certain circumstances, cumbersome legal requirements, lack of availability of medical practitioners and health-care facilities, coupled with socioeconomic obstacles made access to safe and legal abortion almost impossible in practice.[87] Women were reluctant to seek an abortion and post-abortion care because of the lack of access to relevant information, family planning and appropriate services, as well as social stigma and religious reproach.[88]

61. HRW stated while Zambia had taken steps to prevent and treat HIV/AIDs and other sexually transmitted diseases, greater efforts should be made to ensure that services relating to the prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases were inclusive of, and accessible to, all people, including adults and children with disabilities.[89]

62. JS5 stated that marginalized groups – sex workers, men who have sex with men, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals, adolescents and youth – were disproportionately affected by HIV and AIDS due to factors such as discrimination, poverty, lack of access to education, health, mental wellbeing and other services that promote the access to health awareness.[90]

Right to education[91]

63. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the 2012 review, APG23 stated that achieving universal access to education remained a difficult challenge.[92] It made recommendations including ensuring the building of new class rooms in existing schools and the recruitment of a greater number of teachers to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio and the number of pupils per class.[93]

64. ERI stated that while the Government had taken steps to improve access to education, accessibility to education remained a significant problem due to the lack of infrastructure and adequate training for teachers. From a demographic perspective, there were a limited number of places in schools in high-density areas and in low density areas children were required to travel long distances to reach school.[94]

65. RFSU stated that Zambia had endorsed the Eastern and Southern African Ministerial Commitment on comprehensive sexuality education and sexual and reproductive health services for adolescents and young people and although remarkable progress had been made to implement this Commitment, there were still challenges in relation to the availability of comprehensive sexual education at a local level and for those adolescents who were out of school, as well as in the quality of the education provided.[95]

66. JS3 stated that an estimated 1,400,000 children were in need of access to a least one year of organized learning before starting primary school.[96]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[97]

67. JS5 stated that the position of women remained subordinate to that of their male counterparts, mainly as a result of conservative interpretations of religion, patriarchy and gender stereotypes and norms, which is bolstered through the dual legal system and in particular the application of customary laws most of which institutionalize patriarchal views of the role of women in the family.[98] In particular, customary law and practice on marriages, divorce and inheritance, fail to adequately protect women and ensure that their rights to non-discrimination and equality are realized.[99]

68. HRW stated that the large-scale agricultural deals involving rural communities disproportionately impacted on women. Resettlement and compensation were left up to the investor and the authorities played a minimal role in resettlement and compensation discussions affecting local residents. In the Serenje district, Central province, women described barriers to participation, in meetings relevant to their eviction, including the fear of being subjected to aggressive and violent behaviour. Furthermore, due to the resettlement, women walked further to fetch water, firewood and other resources, experienced hardships in managing limited access to food, and experienced difficulties due to loss of farm and non-farm income from the sale of forest products such as roots, mushrooms, leaves, caterpillars and sometimes rats.[100]

69. JS5 referred to the Anti-Gender Based Violence Act and the Rape Act and stated that marital rape was not criminalized. It recommended a revision of both of these Acts to ensure the criminalization of marital rape and rape by intimate partners.[101] JS3 stated that the shelters for victims of gender-based violence as provided for in the Anti-Gender Based Violence Act were yet to be constructed and that the fund for victims was yet to be established.[102]

Children[103]

70. JS3 stated that there was an estimated 1.3 million orphans, 20 000 child-led households, and about 20 percent of the children below the age of 18 years were not living with either biological parent. JS3 called on Zambia to progressively establish alternative care institutions and to popularize foster care.[104]

71. JS2 stated that child-marriage had a major impact on the development of young girls. It contributed to the high rate of girls dropping out of school, early pregnancies, and HIV/AIDS prevalence among young girls.[105] Referring to relevant recommendations from the 2012 review,[106] JS2 stated that Zambia has shown firm commitment and made significant efforts towards eradicating the practice of child marriage. Notwithstanding, there was an urgent need for law reform to harmonize legislative provisions on marriage and ensure their compliance with international human rights law, which included accelerating the adoption of the Marriage Bill (2015) which, once adopted, will ban child marriage, set the minimum age for marriage at 18 years and provide for free consent to marriage by both parties.[107]

72. JS3 stated that children who were victims of sexual abuse were not given rehabilitation or compensation and recommended enacting a rehabilitation and compensations policy, pursuant to article 39 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.[108]

73. GIEACPC recalled that at the 2012 review, Zambia supported recommendations to prohibit corporal punishment in all settings.[108] In 2016, a new Constitution was drafted which included prohibition of corporal punishment within its Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights, which was subjected to a referendum, was not approved due to a low turnout.[110] Although corporal punishment of children was unlawful in the penal system, in schools and in some forms of day care, it remained lawful in the home, alternative care settings and in early childhood care and in day care for children where article 46 of the Juvenile Act of 1956 applies.[111]

74. JS3 stated that the burden of alternative care had been placed on private institutions and individuals. It made recommendations including the establishment of public alternative care institutions, and the popularization of foster care.[112]

75. JS3 stated that Child labour had remained high in the domestic household and in the agricultural and the informal sector. The Employment of Young Persons and Children's Act which defined the minimum age for employment and prohibited hazardous forms of child labour, had gaps in the classification of worst forms of child labour.[113]

Persons with disabilities

76. SALC stated that the Persons with Disabilities Act had been enacted in 2012 as part of the efforts to integrate the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities into the national legal framework. However, a number of provisions from the Convention were left out of the Act and thus significantly undermining the extent to which women and children with disabilities as well as other persons with disabilities, generally, can enjoy their human rights. SALC called for a review of the Act to ensure its consistency with the standards entrenched in the Convention.[114]

77. SALC stated that although the Government had adopted a National Policy on Disability, which was a welcome development, outdated pieces of legislation continued to undermine the enjoyment of human rights by persons with disabilities. It noted, for instance, that the Mental Disorder Act of 1951 authorises psychiatric interventions without free or informed consent, and the arrest and detention of individuals with psychosocial and intellectual disabilities on the grounds of their disabilities or non-criminal behaviour.[115]

78. SALC stated that stigma and discrimination continued to undermine the enjoyment of human rights of persons with disabilities. Persons with disabilities experienced a lack of physical access to health facilities, refusal to be treated, failure to be treated with dignity by health care workers, and verbal abuse. Health care workers often failed to recognize persons with disabilities as autonomous persons who were able to consent to treatment and who were entitled to health care services including sexual and reproductive health care services.[116]

79. APG23 stated that there were very few specialized instructors or teachers to assist persons with disabilities at the primary, secondary and tertiary education levels. Education facilities lacked infrastructure and assistive devices necessary to reasonably accommodate persons with disabilities.[117]

Minorities and indigenous peoples

80. BNFA stated that the rights to self-determination of the people of Barotseland had been infringed by Zambia. The Constitution and legislation contradicted the spirit of the Barotseland Agreement of 1964, and violated the right to self-determination of the Barotse people.[118]

Stateless persons[119]

81. ERI stated that birth registration was a key area of concern given that a failure to register a child deprives that the child of his or her nationality. Birth registration was free in the first month of the child's birth. Late registration was subjected to a fee which was a disincentive for registering births.[120]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org. (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with "A" status).

Civil society

Individual submissions:

ADF	ADF International, Geneva, Switzerland;
AI	Amnesty International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
APG23	Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Rimini, Italy;
BNFA	Barotse National Freedom Alliance, Mongu, Zambia;
ERI	Edmund Rice International, Geneva, Switzerland;
GIEACPC	End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva, Switzerland;
PAI	Pan Africa ILGA, Johannesburg, South Africa;
RFSU	The Swedish Association for Sexuality Education, Stockholm, Sweden;
SALC	Southern Africa Litigation Centre, Johannesburg, South Africa;
TCC	The Carter Center, Atlanta, United States of America.

Joint submissions:

JS1	CIVICUS World Alliance for Citizen Participation and Zambia Council for Social Development (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	Franciscan International, Edmund Rice International and Marist International Solidarity Foundation;
JS3	National Child Rights Forum on behalf of: Zambia Civic Education Association, Regional Psychosocial Support Initiative Zambia, Children in Need Network, Advocacy for Child Justice, Media Network on Child Rights and Development, Full Proof Mission, Girl Guides Association of Zambia, Society for Women and Aids in Zambia, Young Women in Action, SOS Children's Village Zambia, Bwafwano Integrated Services Organisation, Women for Change, Zambia Open Community Schools, Zitukule SHG Consortium, Lusaka, Zambia (Joint Submission 3);
JS4	PEN Zambia and PEN International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Joint Submission 4);
JS5	Engender Rights Centre for Justice, Friends of Rainka, Generation Alive, TransBantu Zambia, The Lotus Identity, Women's Alliance for Equality, Coalition of African Lesbians and Sexual Rights Initiative (Joint Submission 5).

National human rights institution:

ZHRC	Zambia Human Rights Commission, Lusaka, Zambia.

[2] ZHRC, p. 3.

[3] *See* Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, Zambia, A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012.

4 See A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, para. 102.19 (Iraq).
5 JS8/C, p. 2.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid., p. 3.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid, p. 6; JS8/C made a recommendation (p. 6).
11 Ibid., p. 4.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid. JS8/C made recommendations (p. 5).
14 Ibid., p. 5.
15 Ibid. JS8/C made recommendations (p. 6).
16 Ibid. JS8/C made a recommendation (p. 6).
17 Ibid., p. 6; JS8/C made recommendations (p. 7).
18 Ibid., p. 7.
19 Ibid., p. 6; JS8/C made a recommendation (p. 6).
20 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102.7, 102.9, 102.11, 102.14, 102.16 – 102.29, 103.1 – 103.3 – 103.9, 103.18, 103.31, 103.32 and 103.46.
21 SAI/C, paras. 2.1 and 2.3 (see also AI, p. 2).
22 SPN/23, para. 3.5.
23 The submission by JS3 focused solely on the rights of children (p. 1).
24 JS3, para. 6.
25 AI, p. 2.
26 JS3, paras. 6-9.
27 AI, pp. 3 and 4, and fn. 4 referring to A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, para. 102.19 (Iraq).
28 JS3, para. 15.
29 SPN/23, para. 3.5.
30 HRI, para. 39.
31 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102.1, 102.3, 02.4, 102.6, 102.8, 102.12, 102.15, 102.60, 102.52, 102.64, 103.10, 103.14 - 103.16, 103.20 – 103.24 and 103.55.
32 AI, p.1. See also SAI/C, para. 2.2. SAI/C made recommendations (paras. 2.2 (a) and (b).
33 PAI, para. 23.
34 HRW, p. 9, referring to the Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, 31 December 2012, A/HRC/22/13, para. 103.10 (Slovakia) and Report of the Human Rights Council on its twenty-second session (advanced unedited version), A/HRC/22/2, paras. 677 and 702.
35 JS3, para. 8. JS3 made recommendations (para. 9).
36 JS5, para. 7.
37 JS1, para. 1.5, referring to A/HRC/22/13, para. 102.15 (Thailand).
38 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102.43, 103.12, 103.13 and 103.35.
39 AI, p. 4. AI made recommendations, p. 5.
40 HRW, p. 4. HRW made recommendations (p. 7).
41 JS1/M1, para. 19.
42 Ibid., para. 22. For other recommendations see para. 22.
43 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, para. 102.68.
44 JS2, paras. 13 and 14, referring to A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, para. 102.68 (Namibia).
45 Ibid., para 18. JS2 made recommendations (para. 23).
46 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102.5, 102.22, 102.35 – 102.41, 103.57 – 103.63.
47 AI, p. 4.
48 JS1/M1, paras. 10 and 11.
49 JS3, para. 14.
50 SAI/C, paras. 3.18 – 3.20 (a) and (b).
51 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102.44, 103.51 – 103.53.
52 JS1, para. 1.9, referring to A/HRC/22/13, paras. 102.44 (United States of America) and 103.52.

(Ireland).

[51] AI, p. 1 and fn. 2, referring to A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, para. 102.44 (United States of America). AI made recommendations (p. 4).
[52] AI, p. 3. AI made recommendations (p. 4).
[53] *JS4*, para. 20.
[54] *Ibid.*, para. 2, referring to A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, para. 102.44 (United States of America) and paras. 10, 15 and 24.
[55] SALC, paras. 3.9 and 3.10.
[56] *JS4*, para. 17. *JS4* made a recommendation (para. 24).
[57] *JS1*, paras. 1.8, 2.2 and 2.5.
[58] *JS4*, para. 22. *JS4* made a recommendation (para. 24).
[59] *JS1*, para. 3.2.
[60] *Ibid.*, para. 6. *JS1* made recommendations (paras. 6.1-6.6).
[61] AI, p. 3.
[62] *JS1*, para. 1.5, referring to A/HRC/22/13, para. 102.4 (United States of America).
[63] ICC, p. 1.
[64] *Ibid.*, p. 2, paras. 1.1 and 1.2.
[65] *Ibid.*, p. 2.
[66] *Ibid.*, p. 3, paras. 2.1-2.3.
[67] *Ibid.*, p. 3. ICC made recommendations (p. 3, paras. 3.1-3.3).
[68] *Ibid.*, p. 1 and pp. 5-6. ICC made recommendations (p. 6).
[69] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102.2, 102.42, 102.69, 103.11.
[70] *JS3*, para. 36. *JS3* made recommendations (para. 37).
[71] *JS5*, p. 3, para. 6.
[72] SALC, paras. 3.3-3.5 (a).
[73] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, para. 102.45.
[74] *JS5*, p. 8, para. 35 and p. 9, para. 3.
[75] *JS3*, paras. 17 and 18.
[76] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, para. 102.46.
[77] *JS3*, para. 20.
[78] UPG, paras. 1.1 and 1.2.
[79] *Ibid.*, para. 1.3.
[80] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102.10, 102.47, 102.49 – 102.62, 104.1.
[81] *JS5*, p. 5, para. 20.
[82] ADF, para. 11.
[83] *Ibid.*, para. 17.
[84] *JS5*, p. 5, para. 19.
[85] RFSU, para. 12.
[86] *Ibid.*, para. 13. RFSU made recommendations (para. 14).
[87] HRW, pp. 1-2. HRW made recommendations (p. 2).
[88] *JS5*, p. 3, para. 9.
[89] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102.63, 102.65 – 102.67, 102.70.
[90] APG23, para. 2.1, referring to A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102.62 (Senegal), 102.63 (Togo), 102.64 (Paraguay), 102.65 (Algeria), 102.66 (Hungary) and 102.67 (Mexico).
[91] *Ibid.*, para. 2.4.
[92] ERI, para. 6. ERI made recommendations (para. 10).
[93] RFSU, paras. 15 and 16. RFSU made recommendations (para. 18).
[94] *JS3*, para. 20.
[95] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102.27 – 102.29, 102.30, 102.31 – 102.34, 103.17, 103.19, 103.27 – 103.29, 103.34, 103.47 – 103.49.
[96] *JS5*, p. 9, para. 40.
[97] *Ibid.*, p. 9, para. 41.
[98] HRW, p. 3. HRW made recommendations (p. 4).

[99] JS5, p. 7, paras. 26 and p.10, para. 7.
[100] JS1, p. 8, paras. 32 and 33. See also JS5 p. 10, para. 8.
[101] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102.13, 102.20, 102.21, 102.23 – 102.26, 103.24, 103.26, 103.30, 103.36, 103.50.
[102] JS3, paras. 22 and 23.
[103] JS2, para. 11.
[104] See A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 103.17 (Finland) and 103.27 (Uruguay).
[105] JS2, paras. 8 and 9. JS2 made recommendations (para. 12). See also UPR, paras. 17, 18, 24 and 28 and JS3, paras. 28 and 29.
[106] *Ibid*., paras. 34 and 35.
[107] cdf/ACPC, para. 1.1, referring to A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, paras. 102. 23 (Belarus), 102.25 (Slovenia) and 102.26 (Mexico).
[108] cdf/ACPC, para. 1.2.
[109] *Ibid*., paras. 2.1 – 2.8. See also JS3, paras. 30 and 31.
[110] JS3, paras. 22 and 23.
[111] *Ibid*., para. 26. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 27).
[112] SALC, para. 2.3 (c).
[113] *Ibid*., para. 3.1.
[114] *Ibid*., para. 3.2. SALC made recommendations (para. 3.2 (a)-(c)).
[115] ADF(Z), para. 2.2.
[116] HNFA, pp. 1-3.
[117] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/22/13, 31 December 2012, para. 103.54.
[118] UPR, paras. 29-31. UPR made recommendations (para. 38). See also JS3, paras. 24 and 25.